DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 054 UD 026 278

AUTHOR Campbell, Bruce A.
TITLE The Impact of School Desegregation: An Investigation of Three Mediating Factors.
INSTITUTION Georgia Univ., Athens.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 10 Apr 76
GRANT NEG-00-3-0188
NOTE 59p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association (Dallas, TX, April 8-10, 1976). Portions contain light type.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Behavior Theories; *Desegregation Effects; Educational Environment; Family Influence; High Schools; *High School Students; Peer Influence; Political Attitudes; *Racial Attitudes; *Research Methodology; School Desegregation; Self Esteem; Social Science Research; Social Theories; *Student Attitudes; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS Georgia (Atlanta); *Theory Development

ABSTRACT

The inconsistency of results to be found in the study of the impact of school desegregation arises in part from the failure to appreciate the complexity of the phenomenon. This report takes a broader view of school desegregation; the basic dependent variables are school level means in the following basic areas: (1) racial attitudes, (2) political attitudes; (3) self-confidence; and (4) achievement. Using a one-way analysis of variance approach, the investigation examined the ability of each of three mediating variables--the school environment, the family, and the peer group--to reduce the original differences in the inter-school means (considered separately for each race). The following theoretical approaches to understanding inter-school differences are considered: (1) contact theory; (2) deprivation theory; and (3) socialization theory. Seniors in six Southern urban high schools were surveyed, and 85 percent of them were interviewed. It was found that, although significant relationships may exist between a covariate and a dependent variable, there may be no reduction in inter-school differences when the covariate is removed. This factor may explain a good deal of the contradiction in earlier findings. Overall, contact theory was found to be unsatisfactory as an approach to understanding inter-school differences. Socialization theory is satisfactory only for whites, and only in the areas of political and racial attitudes. Deprivation theory is most successful, for both races and for all four of the tested areas. Data are presented on eight tables. An appendix lists the survey questions. A 40-item list of references is included. (Author/BJV)

7-7-88 uD

ED297054

The Impact of School Desegregation: An Investigation of Three Mediating Factors

by

Bruce A. Campbell

University of Georgia

Prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association, Dallas, Texas, April 8-10, 1976. The assistance of Susan Dukes is gratefully acknowledged. This research was made possible by a grant from the National Institute for Education (Grant Number NEG-00-3-0188).

UD026278

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Impact of School Desegregation: An Investigation of Three Mediating Variables

Bruce A. Campbell

Abstract

As St. John has observed, the inconsistency of results to be found in the study of the impact of school desegregation arises in part from the failure to appreciate the complexity of the phenomenon. Interracial contact, for instance, is sometimes found to be related to less hostile racial attitudes, sometimes it is related to more hostile racial attitudes. The present investigation attempts to take a broader view of school desegregation. The basic dependent variable are school level means in four basic areas: racial attitudes, political attitudes, self-confidence and achievement. Using a one-way analysis of variance approach, we investigate the ability of each of three mediating variables to reduce the original differences in the inter-school means (considered separately for each race). These mediating variables involve the school environment, the family and the peer group. Three theoretical approaches to the understanding of the inter-school differences are considered: contact theory, deprivation theory, and socialization theory.

The most striking result is that while significant relationships may exist between a covariate and a dependent variable (as between racial hostility--a measure of school environment--and feelings of racial distance). There may be no reduction in inter-school differences when the covariate is removed. This factor may explain a good deal of the contradiction in earlier findings.

Over-all, contact theory is judged unsatisfactory as an approach to understanding inter-school differences. Socialization theory is satisfactory only for whites, and only in the areas of political and racial attitudes. Deprivation theory is most successful, for both races and for all four of the tested areas.

The study of the impact of school desegregation has been a continuing source of frustration to scholars. Well over 100 studies on various aspects of this phenomenon have now been published. The fundamental conclusion to which they lead is that "biracial schooling must be judged neither a demonstrated success nor a demonstrated failure" (St. John, p. 119).

There are two primary reasons for the conspicuous lack of conclusiveness in this earlier work. The first lies with weakness in research design. There are "virtually no long-term longitudinal studies with pre-desegregation and post-desegregation scores on the same tests and with subjects randomly assigned to experimental and control conditions" (St. John, p. 120).

It may well be that such ideal design conditions can never be achieved in this particular area. While numerous studies have conducted pre-tests and post-tests (see St. John, pp. 141-193 for a compilation of studies), in most cases, school desegregation was already ongoing at the pretest stage, or at least the community was well aware that it was being planned. One must suppose that the anticipation of the event contaminated pretests in many instances, particularly those involving interracial attitudes. And of course, it is hardly surprising that random assignment of children to experimental and control groups is a virtual impossibility in a situation such as those under study.

The second reason which underlies the lack of conclusiveness in school desegregation studies is that desegregation has been viewed as a "simple" process, in the sense that the act of attending a desegregated school has been conceived as producing a single effect which is felt in the same way

by all students. In fact, desegregation has a multifaceted nature, meaning different things to different children, and even different things to the same children in different circumstances. St. John (1975), for instance, discusses nine different meanings which desegregation may have for black children (pp. 88 ff.).

The way in which our understanding of the impact of school desegregation can be improved, perhaps even made conclusive, is through a greater attention paid to the variety of processes which contribute to the overall outcome. In this paper we shall attempt to achieve this goal through a close examination of three mediating factors. The first of these is the family. St. John (1975) notes that one of the most important limitations of work in this area lies in the absence or crudeness of measures of family background. This remains true in spite of Coleman's (1966) association of family background (primarily SES) with achievement, and the typical findings of the political socialization literature which stress the primary contribution of the family to the child's understanding of the workings of government (Jennings and Niemi, Easton and Dennis).

A second factor which may mediate the desegregation experience is the peer group. The status of the peer group is widely recognized in social psychology (Newcomb, Merton), but the application of this concept and body of theory to the adolescent context and to the school in particular has lagged somewhat behind (but see Remmers and Radler, Kandel and Lesser). Coleman (1961), however, specifically demonstrates that adolescent cultures exist within the high school setting which are not only independent of the school or family, but may also possess goals which are contrary to those espoused by the latter. Earlier work by the present author has demonstrated the importance of the peer group in the area of racial attitudes (B. Campbell),

and Sebert (1974) has found a significant effect of the adolescent peer group on various political attitudes. We therefore expect that the impact of school desegregation should vary considerably as a function of peer group input.

The final mediating factor is the school environment itself. It is clear that we must not view the school as a homogeneous unit in the desegregation process. McPartland (1968) has illustrated this fact very well by his finding that the racial ratio of a school was not the important predictor of achievement; rather, he focused attention on the racial ratios to be found in the classroom. Bullock (1976) has also found that patterns within the school determine outcomes which earlier research has tried to attribute to school-level characteristics. For instance, he found that while students in segregated schools were more racially tolerant than those in desegregated schools, the strongest relationship was to be found between racial tolerance and interracial contact ($r = .25$). Those children who attended a desegregated school and did have contact with students of the opposite race tended to view race more tolerantly than those who attended segregated schools, even though the school means ran in the opposite direction. Thus, a knowledge of the school environment is needed to interpret the impact of desegregation, and we include it as our third mediating factor.

Data

The data upon which this study is based were collected specifically to allow an analysis of the three factors which mediate the outcomes of school desegregation. A sample of six high schools was drawn from the many schools in the Atlanta area in a purposive fashion, so that both upper and lower socioeconomic level families of both races would be adequately represented, and so that racial ratios ranging from all white to all black

would also appear.

Within these six schools, all the seniors were sampled and about 85 percent gave interviews. The peer data were provided by asking each respondent to name his five best friends who were also seniors at that school. Since most named friends also provided interviews, we were supplied with an extremely rich source of peer data whose value is enhanced by the fact that they are provided by the peers themselves.

The parent data are provided by a mail-back questionnaire which was sent to all the parents of responding students. Through a combination of techniques, a return rate of 72 percent was achieved from the students' families, and over 65 percent of the individual parents responded.

Information about the school comes from three sources. First, the principals returned a school characteristics inventory, which provided the typical statistical data about the physical plant, faculty and equipment. Second, the teachers of seniors returned a questionnaire (response rate of 55 percent). This instrument provides attitudinal data for the school faculty, as well as background information. Finally, the students themselves were asked a number of questions about the school environment, particularly in the context of the quality of race relations. These responses may be aggregated to provide descriptors for each school.

Overall, these data represent an advance over other cross-sectional studies of desegregation in a number of respects. First, they are among the few which have been collected in a metropolitan area of the South. St. John's inventory documents a mere handful of such studies conducted over the past 15 years (1975). In fact, she even makes specific note of the fact that a regional bias may be coloring the results collected to date (St. John, p. 6).

Second, the study has been conducted in a half-dozen schools of differing racial ratios and socioeconomic profiles. Clearly, six is still a small number, and we would wish for many more. Nonetheless, we are able to put our hypotheses to a much stronger test than would be possible if only one or two schools had been sampled.

Finally, the clearest strength of these data is the breadth of information which has been collected regarding the three factors whose mediating influence on desegregation we wish to test. Many of the earlier studies imposed no controls on the students sampled beyond the measure of the extent of desegregation, and few indeed imposed any control other than the socioeconomic status of the student's family (as reported by the student) (St. John, pp. 141 ff.). In the present case, these factors are subject to much closer scrutiny.

The Schools

Since the analytical strategy which we follow below focuses on the six schools in the study, we devote the following paragraphs to a brief description of each one. School number one is a large, public, suburban, white school. In 1973-74, about 35 percent of its students were in a college preparatory program, and another 35 percent were in commercial or distributive programs. Thirty percent of the graduating class of 1973 went on to a four-year college. The school reported that it possessed 19 of our list of 28 facilities. This list included such things as a library, auditorium, physics and chemistry labs, and such personnel as counselors, psychologists, and social workers. A 10,000 volume library was one of the facilities reported. (A complete inventory appears in the Appendix.) The school also reported that it offered 14 of the 22 extracurricular activities about which we sought information. This list included student government, newspaper

and annual, athletics, both intramural and inter-school for boys and girls, drama, debate, band orchestra, and so forth. (The complete list appears in the Appendix.) The families of these students were predominantly middle class, with ten percent falling in the upper quartile on our scale of socio-economic level, and 20 percent falling in the bottom quartile.[1]

School number two is an urban, parochial institution of moderate size. Some 60 percent of its students were white in 1973. About 80 percent of these students are in a college preparatory curriculum, and the balance are in a general diploma curriculum. Sixty-five percent of the class of 1973 went to a four-year college. On our list of facilities, this school reported possessing 21 of 28, including a library of over 4,000 volumes. It also reported that it offered 11 of the 22 extracurricular activities. The parents of the students in this school come from a somewhat higher socioeconomic level than do those in school one. Thirty percent were in the highest quartile, and 43 percent were in the second quartile. Only four percent were in the lowest quartile. This school could be characterized as upper-middle class.

School number three is a large private institution which is predominantly white. The entire student body takes the college preparatory curriculum, and all of the class of 1973 went on to a four-year college. The school reported providing 20 of the 28 facilities in our list to its pupils, including a library of 16,000 volumes. Of the 22 listed extracurricular activities, 14 are provided in this school. As one would expect from the curriculum offered in this school, the parents of these students come from the highest socioeconomic levels. Fully 85 percent of these families were in the top quartile of our scale, and the balance were in the second quartile. This school is the model upper-class institution.

School number four is a large, urban public school which was about

70 percent white in 1973-74. About ten percent of this school's seniors are in a college preparatory curriculum. Some 35 percent are in industrial and vocational cirricula, 20 percent in a commercial curriculum, and 30 percent in a general diploma curriculum. This school sent ten percent of its graduates to a four-year college in the fall of 1973. Twenty-four of the 28 facilities were provided in this school, which also supported 15 of the 22 extracurricula activities. The families of these students fall heavily in the lower segments of the socioeconomic scale. Fifty-five percent were in the lowest quartile, and only 15 percent were in the upper half of the distribution. This school is one of our two lower-middle class institutions.

The fifth school is an urban public school of intermediate size. In 1973, it was about 30 percent white and was in a state of rapid transition from white to black. Like school four, about ten percent of these students were in a college preparatory curriculum. However, instead of school four's emphasis on vocational and commercial curricula, the bulk of the students here were in general diploma (31 percent) or cooperative education (28 percent) curricula. Fourteen percent were in industrial or vocational programs and 17 percent in commercial programs. Fifteen percent of the previous year's seniors went on to a four-year college. This school reported providing 22 of the 28 facilities, and possesses a library of 17,500 volumes. Thirteen of the 22 extracurricular activities are supported here as well. This school is the second lower-middle class institution. Over 50 percent of the families of pupils fall in the lower quartile of the socioeconomic level scale, and about 16 percent fall in the upper half. This school appears to be the near twin of school number four, except that the dominant race is reversed.

Finally, school number six is a large, central city, public high school which is nearly all black. About 30 percent of its seniors are in a college preparatory program, and a like number are in a general diploma program. The remainder are evenly divided (20 percent each) between the commercial and the industrial-vocational curricula. Forty-four percent of the seniors of 1973 went on to a four-year college. Of the 28 facilities assessed in our list, 23 were provided in this school. In addition, 15 of the 22 extracurricular activities were supported. The socioeconomic profile of the families of this school's seniors is fairly high. Nearly a quarter of the families are in the upper quartile of the scale, and over 30 percent are in the second quartile. Only one-sixth fall in the lowest quartile. Overall, this school ranks third of the six in socioeconomic level, and is located squarely in the middle-class range.

The Dependent Variables

Along what dimensions should the impact of school desegregation be measured? Over the past ten or 15 years, scholars have chosen to answer that question in three basic ways. Their concerns have been with academic achievement, racial attitudes, and minority self-concept.

Since the primary goal of the present paper is to explore the role of the three mediating factors of family, peers and school environment, we seek to cast the broadest possible net. Accordingly, we shall investigate all three of these basic types of outcome.

Perhaps because of the hopeless multidimensionality of the concept of academic achievement, our measures are most simple and straightforward. Since we were not able to administer tests of achievement ourselves as were Coleman (1966) and Bachman (1972), we relied on the student's self-reported grade-point average, and on the verbal achievement test score which was

provided by school records. Moreover, given the fact that grade-point averages normalize away a good deal of the inter-school difference, the standardized achievement score appears to be the best operational measure available to us for this class of dependent variable.

While studies of minority group children often focus on academic achievement, studies of whites tend to revolve about the impact of desegregation on racial prejudice. In the present case, we shall study the racial attitudes of both our black and white respondents.

While the measurement of racial attitudes has not been subject to the debate which has surrounded the measurement of achievement, great variety is still to be found. One of the most important things to be concluded from this heterogeneity is that racial attitudes cannot be measured along any single dimension. Accordingly, we employ three dimensions, following A. Campbell (1971), Harding, et al. (1969), and Ehrlich (1973). Harding (1969) describes three dimensions of intergroup attitudes as follows (pp. 37 ff.):

> The conative components of an ethnic attitude include beliefs about "what should be done" with regard to the group in question and action orientation of the individual toward specific members of the group; the cognitive components are the perceptions, beliefs and expectations that the individual holds with regard to various ethnic groups; the affective components of an ethnic attitude include both the general favorability or unfavorability of the attitude and the specific feelings that give the attitude its affective coloring. On the positive side they include such feelings as admiration, sympathy, and "closeness" or identification; on the negative side they include contempt, fear, envy, and "distance" or alienation.

In order to operationalize these three components in the specific area of race, we have replicated the scales developed by A. Campbell (1971). The first, or conative dimension, has traditionally been linked with the social distance concept of Bogardus (1925). Accordingly, our measure of this component is drawn from five questions asking whether the respondent

would accept a member of the opposite race in a variety of contexts. (These items and all those discussed below appear in the Appendix.)

The cognitive element of racial attitude rests on an assessment of the extent to which the respondent thinks that blacks are being discriminated against in various ways by white society. The affective element is measured by determining the degree of sympathy felt by each of our respondents toward various activities of the civil rights movement.

The third category of dependent variables deals with the concept of self-confidence. One of the primary arguments in the Brown decision of the Supreme Court was that to be compelled to attend separate schools gave blacks a sense of worthlessness from which they could never escape.

> To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generages a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone.

Unfortunately, both scholarly opinion and empirical evidence remain sharply divided on the issue. A number of antidesegregation arguments have been voiced by those who profess concern over the damage to black children which may be brought about by the psychic tension of desegregation (Arendt, Armstrong and Gregor, Bronfenbrenner). The basic position of these scholars is that when blacks come into a previously white school, they are ill-prepared for the stepped-up levels of performance which are demanded of them, as well as for the high level of competition provided by whites. In addition, blacks must often face hostility and discrimination within the school, which may lead to intense frustration should the school administration prove insensitive. The effect is discouragement and hostility which may be directed either outward or inward.

On the other side, the bulk of the social science community appears to reject these fears. Holland (1964) and Coles (1967), for instance, specifically reject the psychological hazard thesis as grossly exaggerated, while Ausubel and Ausubel (1963) and Haggstrom argue that stress will be less severe under desegregation than under continued segregation. On the positive side, scholars argue that desegregation is necessary to eradicate the stigma of the Southern caste system (Pinderhughes), and to arrest the movement toward "two Americas, separate and unequal" foreseen by the Kerner Commission (1968).

Our own study of self-concept investigates two subareas. The first is self-confidence, and in particular the sense of ego strength assessed by Rotte (1966). The second is level of aspiration. Following earlier work, we have assessed both respondents' level of education and occupational aspiratio

A fourth set of dependent variables is included in our study, even though they are not often found in work on school desegregation. Students of political socialization have repeatedly found that the school experience has an impact upon certain political attitudes (see especially Hess and Torney, 1967). It is possible that the differential treatment (if indeed any exists) received by blacks when they are in all-black schools, compared to those who are in majority-white schools, could produce different viewpoints on the political process. For instance, blacks in segregated schools would never have to confront problems of racial discrimination in their dealings with school authorities. These students, if placed in a white school, might find themselves blocked from any effective relationship with the school authority structure through discriminatory mechanisms. If, therefore, the school's authority system is seen by the student as a part of a larger political system, such experiences in the desegregated environme

could lead to increased cynicism, withdrawal or feelings of inefficacy. Accordingly, we have included three measures: political cynicism, political efficacy and political interest.

Analytical Strategy

The question most often asked in the past by those who have studied school desegregation has been: Do we find differences between blacks (or whites) who attend desegregated schools and those who do not? As we have discussed, this overly-narrow focus has produced highly inconsistent results. In our own analysis, we intend to approach the problem in a somewhat different way. Our question becomes: How can we explain differences which exist between whites and blacks in the six schools which we have studied? This approach has two advantages. First, it does not set up the factor of desegregation as the sole or even the primary explanatory variable. It is one of a number of possible explanations. Second, this approach allows the direct application of the mediating variables which have been developed in this study.

The sort of information with which we shall be dealing can be displayed schematically in the following way.

- - - - - - - - - -

Figure 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - -

This figure shows the mean scores for each race which obtain in each schoo and it is the differences between these means which provide the basis for our analysis.

The ideal algorithm to use in this case is two-way analysis of variance. Unfortunately, the nesting pattern created by the three segregated schools would limit such an analysis to schools two, four and five. Consequently, our procedure will be to conduct two one-way analyses of variance, calculati

Figure 1

Schema of Race and School Differences

Race	School 1	2	3	4	5	6
White	$\bar{W}_1$	$\bar{W}_2$	$\bar{W}_3$	$\bar{W}_4$	$\bar{W}_5$	--
Black	--	$\bar{B}_2$	--	$\bar{B}_4$	$\bar{B}_5$	$\bar{B}_6$

the significance of the between-school means separately for each race. These analyses will reveal the extent to which significant inter-school differences exist for each race on each of our dependent variables.

In order to assess the extent to which these inter-school differences are influenced by our mediating variables, analysis of covariance will be employed. In essence, this procedure removes from the dependent variable all variation arising from the mediating variable in question, and then determines whether any significant differences remain between the residual school means. If school differences are explained by any of these mediating variables, then the process of removing them should produce equal school means.

The School Means

The first set of results contains the basic school means produced by the eleven dependent variables (grouped into four categories).

- - - - - - -
Table 1 here
- - - - - - -

Looking first at the political attitudes, it is clear that the differences from school to school are modest at best. Blacks are equally cynical about politics, regardless of which school they attend. The school differences for whites are equally small with the single exception of school four. Its higher mean level of cynicism just barely reaches a significant level. Overall, the blacks in this sample are a good deal more cynical than whites.

On the political efficacy scale, the races are significantly different, with whites being slightly more efficacious than blacks. Again, blacks do not differ from school to school at all. Whites, on the other hand, show a relatively strong inter-school difference. The two private schools have students with higher levels of efficacy, while the lowest level is

TABLE 1

Race-School Means for Four Groups of Dependent Variables

Political Attitudes	School						Inter-School Differences			Interracial Differences		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	eta	eta^2	p	eta	eta^2	p
Political Cynicism												
Whites	8.2	8.5	8.1	9.2	8.2	--	.14	.02	.05	.31	.10	.01
Blacks	--	9.1	--	9.4	9.6	9.6	.07	.00	NS			
Political Efficacy												
Whites	12.1	13.2	14.4	11.5	11.2	--	.27	.07	.01	.10	.01	.01
Blacks	--	12.4	--	11.9	11.7	11.7	.04	.00	NS			
Political Interest												
Whites	2.6	2.5	2.4	3.2	2.9	--	.15	.02	.05	.17	.03	.01
Blacks	--	2.8	--	3.1	3.8	3.0	.18	.03	.01			
Racial Attitudes												
Racial Distance												
Whites	2.8	1.6	2.0	2.1	3.2	--	.47	.22	.01	.27	.07	.01
Blacks	--	1.5	--	1.8	2.3	2.0	.22	.05	.01			
Perception of Discrimination												
Whites	2.0	2.1	1.8	2.1	2.4	--	.28	.14	.01	.09	.01	.01
Blacks	--	1.8	--	1.9	1.9	1.9	.08	.01	NS			
Sympathy with Black Protest												
Whites	2.7	2.2	2.0	2.5	3.2	--	.40	.16	.01	.27	.07	.01
Blacks	--	1.6	--	2.2	2.1	1.8	.25	.07	.01			

TABLE 1 - Continued

Achievement	School						Inter-School Differences			Interracial Differences		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	eta	eta^2	p	eta	eta^2	p
Grade Point Average												
Whites	5.6	5.5	4.7	4.9	5.6	--	.24	.06	.01	.22	.05	.01
Blacks	--	6.4	--	5.9	7.0	6.0	.21	.04	.01			
Achievement Score												
Whites	101.2	97.6	106.7	103.2	99.6	--	.23	.05	.01	.40	.16	.01
Blacks	--	105.7	--	84.7	81.9	91.6	.39	.15	.01			
Self-Confidence												
Job Aspiration												
Whites	61.9	64.3	75.3	68.2	59.3	--	.30	.09	.01	.05	.00	NS
Blacks	--	70.9	--	59.0	53.0	68.8	.29	.08	.01			
Educational Aspiration												
Whites	77.0	79.3	82.9	77.9	74.0	--	.32	.10	.01	.00	.00	NS
Blacks	--	80.2	--	76.4	75.9	80.1	.22	.05	.01			
Ego Strength												
Whites	3.6	3.3	4.1	3.8	3.7	--	.15	.02	.05	.19	.04	.01
Blacks	--	3.7	--	2.9	2.8	3.4	.17	.03	.05			
Frequencies												
Whites	259	38	159	22	86	4						
Blacks	0.	18	0	131	45	173						

observed in the lower SEL, majority-black school number five.

Racial differences again appear on the political interest scale. This time, however, both blacks and whites display significant inter-school differences. Interestingly, in the three schools where black-white comparisons are possible, there is no regular pattern. Blacks show a higher level of interest than whites in school four, but are lower in school two and considerably lower in school five.

Moving to the second group of indicators, which reflect racial attitudes, we find differences between schools which are much more profound, especially for whites. The racial distance scale is typical of the general pattern. Over a fifth of the total variation in this attitude among our white respondent can be assigned to the school which they attend. While this is less true of blacks, there is still a highly significant effect which is attributable to the school. Overall, the races also differ significantly with blacks reporting a lesser sense of racial distance than whites.

There is also a significant interracial difference for the perception of discrimination, although in this case the magnitude of the difference is quite small, with blacks tending to be a bit more sensitive to discrimination. From school to school, blacks show no significant differences whatever. The school context has no bearing on their attitudes on this particular dimension. Among whites, however, there is a large school effect. Those whites who attend the upper-SEL private school (number three) are fully as sensitive to discrimination against blacks as are the blacks themselves. The least sensitive whites attend the majority-black school number five.

Finally, there are also significant interracial and inter-school differences in the level of sympathy with black protest. Blacks, as one would anticipate, are more sympathetic than whites. The inter-school differences are very

large for whites in particular, and the black differences are among the largest observed for that race.

Moving to the third category of impact, we find that achievement, as measured by grade-point average, shows inter-school differences for both races. Blacks are also significantly lower on the grade scale than whites across the board. The standardized verbal achievement measure, as we predicted, reveals somewhat larger inter-school differences. The black differences, in fact, are the largest of any of the eleven variables in the table. Of course, this is not to say that achievement is related to desegregation. It so happens that the highest black achievement score occurs in one of the segregated schools, but this school is also a good deal higher on the socioeconomic scale than are the others in the study which were attended by blacks.

Finally, we have three scales which measure various aspects of self-confidence. The first of these deals with occupational aspiration. For the first time, we find that there are no interracial differences. Both races would like to hold jobs of equal stature. There remain, however, significant inter-school differences for both blacks and whites.

The second measure of self-confidence, involving educational aspiration, also shows no difference between the races. Inter-school differences are again significant, in a pattern which matches very closely those of the previous variable.

The third scale is produced by the measure of ego strength. Once again, few inter-school differences emerge. Here, however, there is some tendency for whites to show greater ego-strength than blacks.

To sum up, Table 1 has two over-arching patterns. First, significant racial differences do exist on all the variables tested save those involving

aspirations. Second, when we examine the nature of the inter-school differences, we find that these differences are larger for whites than for blacks in eight of the eleven cases. In three instances, in fact, there are no significant inter-school differences for blacks, while every set of differences observed for whites is significant at $p < .05$ at least. Clearly, to examine the school should be a more productive course to find the influences underlying white responses, than it will be for black responses.

Throughout this brief description of Table 1, we have refrained from discoursing on what might have produced the inter-school differences which we observed. The clearest temptation would have been to treat these differences in terms of the school characteristics themselves. Thus, we might have observ that the whites with the greatest mean racial distance attended school number five, a lower-middle class school which is mostly black. The highest level of job aspiration among blacks, on the other hand, is found in school two, in whi blacks are in a minority, but it is a school which has generally upper-middle class students, and it annually sends a large proportion of its graduates on t college. Instead of this, we turn to the three mediating factors.

The Mediating Factors

As we discussed at the outset, the primary contribution of this study lies in its ability to provide measures of high validity for various of the factors which might have produced the observed inter-school differences. We shall discuss three sets of measures: those pertaining to the family, those pertaining to the peer group, and those pertaining to the school and its environment. It is clear, however, that each of these mediating factors can easily be operationalized in a variety of ways. Since there are eleven dependent variables, the possibility exists for generating hundreds of hypotheses. In order to choose a few of these hundreds, we turn to three

main theoretical approaches: racial contact theory, deprivation theory and socialization theory. These theories are called upon to indicate which of the possible hypotheses will be at once the most likely to be confirmed, and if confirmed, will the the most likely to be meaningful.

Contact Theory

Contact theory departs from the premise that interracial attitudes are often the product of negative stereotypes. These stereotypes lead to negative evaluation of racial group members without appeal to any information provided by the individual himself beyond that which is needed to determine the group membership. As Bullock (1976) describes the central hypothesis of contact theory, when blacks and whites can interact, it becomes difficult to classify people into stereotypic groups because the fund of information becomes too large, and the logical inappropriateness of the stereotypic image becomes inescapable. The theory predicts that given sufficient contact, people will come to evaluate those in different racial or ethnic groups as individuals, rather than in terms of stereotypes.

The evidence on contact theory is quite mixed. The well-known study of Deutsch and Collins (1951) found that contact in housing led to improved racial attitudes. The study of Lee and Humphrey (1943) showed that blacks and whites who were neighbors or co-workers did not riot against each other during the Detroit race riots of 1943. Bullock's work (1976), which has been mentioned previously, found that sutdents with cross-race friendships were the most likely to be racially tolerant. Project Concern in Hartford revealed a high level of interracial friendships (generally over 50 percent) and a strong desire among the minority children to remain in the program (Mahan).

It is clear, however, that not all situations of increased contact have led to improved racial attitudes. Armor's study of busing (1972) demonstrated an increase in racial hostility among desegregated schools in Boston. The Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence reports that between 1967 and 1969, the proportion of race-related civil disorders taking place in schools and colleges rose from 11 percent (29 events) to 58 percent (472 events) of all disorders (Baskin, quoted from St. John, p. 82).

Pettigrew's discussion (1971) of the effect of contact has touched on a basic dynamic which may lead to these contrary results. He states that:

> . . . increasing interaction, whether of groups or individuals, intensifies and magnifies processes already underway. Hence, more interracial contact can lead either to greater prejudice and rejection or to greater respect and acceptance, depending upon the situation in which it occurs (p. 275).

In some sense, Pettigrew begs the question. We need to know the origin of the "processes already underway." Allport (1954) provides considerable guidance in this matter. He studies led him to conclude that contact between racial groups will lead to a reduction in prejudice only in instances in which the groups share an equal status, they pursue common goals, and contact is sanctioned by the institutional authorities.

These various strands of evidence may now be brought together to produce an indication of which hypotheses should be selected for the present investigation. We consider first the dependent variables. Most obviously, racial attitudes are engaged by contact theory. We expect, following Bullock (1976) and others, to find inter-school differences reduced when we control for the quality of race relations in each school.

Self-confidence and achievement are also likely to yield to a contact theory approach. Such an expectation is indicated by the work of Katz (1964).

He notes a variety of factors in the desegregated school which might be detrimental to black performance. Among others, his discussion centers on the possibility of rejection by whites, and the consequent isolation felt by blacks. This condition is postulated as leading to "a weakening of resistance to other stress conditions, such as might arise from the inherent difficulty of academic work" (p. 389). These stress conditions would be expected to impinge both upon self-confidence and upon achievement.

From these various perspectives, we generate the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Inter-school differences among both blacks and whites in racial attitudes will be reduced by a control for level of racial hostility.

Hypothesis 2: Inter-school differences among blacks in achievement and self-confidence will be reduced by a control for level of racial hostility.

Hypothesis 3: Inter-school differences among blacks and whites in racial attitudes will be reduced by a control for interracial friendship.

Deprivation Theory

The central thrust of deprivation theory holds that those individuals who are disadvanted in material ways are also denied the opportunities to achieve which are afforded to those who experience more advantaged circumstances. Both Abramson (1972) and Rodgers (1974) discuss a mechanism by which deprivation contributes to low self-confidence. Their analysis also reveals that deprivation leads to feelings of political cynicism and political inefficacy. All of these derive from a basic sense of personal adequacy which is related to the individual's placement in the social structure (Smith, 1968). Illustrative of this line of thinking is Coleman (1966) who discovered that

achievement in American schools was more strongly related to the socioeconomic background of the family than to any school characteristic which was measured in his study.

Thus, earlier work leads us to expect that inter-school differences in self-confidence may be explained through deprivation theory. There is an obvious argument to be made that achievement will relate to deprivation as well. If deprivation begets low self-confidence, then the argument of Katz (1964), which we presented in the context of contact theory, becomes applicable here as well. Low self-confidence means a weakened ability to stand up to the rigors of academic competition, and a tendency to give up and cease making the effort required to achieve.

Deprivation may also be related to achievement in a much more direct and simple way. It is that deprivation will be manifested most readily by an absence of books and other educational materials in the home, as well as a reduction in access to educational opportunities, such as libraries or summer camps, compared to what is available to the non-deprived child.

Abramson (1972) and Rodgers (1974), as we noted above, make the argument that deprivation can be expected to influence political attitudes, which of course include those which we have measured. Finally, Bullock (1976) and numerous others have found that deprivation relates to the racial attitudes which an individual holds. This is explainable in terms of Allport's caution that two groups will develop conciliatory racial attitudes as a result of contact only if the levels of status of the two groups are approximately equal. If one group is deprived, contact will be more likely to intensify racial animosity.

These earlier studies lead us to expect the following from our own data:

Hypothesis 4: Inter-school differences in all four areas will be reduced by a control for the socioeconomic level of the families of the students in each school.

Socialization Theory

Since there is no single theory of socialization, we hasten to point out that under this rubric we are referring to a rather particular sub-category which Allport (1954) has called situational theory. The main elements of this approach are an emphasis on current forces, and an assumption that the individual feels that he must conform to the teachings of his environment.

Of course, Allport emphasizes most strongly the socialization of racial attitudes (p. 213 ff.). In this he is joined by Ehrlich (1973), who states:

> Ethnic attitudes are a part of the social heritage of the developing child. They are transmitted across generations as a component of the accumulated knowledge of society. No person can grow up in a society without learning the prevailing attitudes concerning the major ethnic groups. In fact, given the polarization of ethnic attitudes, we ought to consider the question of how some people escape being prejudiced (p. 110).

In order to employ socialization theory in an attempt to explain the inter-school differences which have been presented above, we shall take advantage of a model advanced by Adler and Harrington (1970) and developed using the present data by Campbell (1975a). In its simplest form, this model presents the socialization process as a sending and receiving of messages. This approach has direct application in three of the four areas under investigation. First, the messages sent by the parent, of the three sources of messages under consideration, might be expected to have the greatest influence on political attitudes (Jennings and Niemi). The parents

will also be expected to influence their offspring's attitudes about race (Campbell, 1975b; Ehrlich). Finally, the parental influence should also be felt strongly in the self-confidence area, because of the critical role played by the parent in the child's establishment of his sense of identity (Erikson). The only area where the parent's influence may be weak is achievement, although it is clear that the parent will influence these outcomes indirectly through the kind of environment which he provides. This is covered, of course, in the test of deprivation theory.

The impact of the parent may be tested through the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5: Inter-school differences in racial attitudes, political attitudes and self-confidence will be reduced by a control for the parents' messages in each area.

The impact of the peer group is also considered. In the political realm, the peers of the high school student have been found to have a generally weak influence on attitudes (Sebert; Campbell, 1975a). The area of racial attitudes is one in which the peer group is much more heavily engaged (Campbell, 1975b). We would expect to find that the observed patterns can be successfully approached by examining differences in peer attitudes. The same may be true of aspirations. If Coleman (1961) is correct in his assessment of the potency of the adolsecent culture in setting goals for achievement, we should find that this set of inter-school differences should also be reduced through knowledge of peer attitudes.

Hypothesis 6: Inter-school differences in racial attitudes, political attitudes and self-confidence will be reduced by a control for the peers' messages in each area.

Results

Each of the hypotheses set out above has been tested in turn through the use of simple one-way analyses of covariance. This procedure allows a

a direct measure of whether a control has reduced the original inter-school differences.

The first three hypotheses all involve tests of contact theory. Accordingly, the covariates, level of racial hostility and interracial friendship, represent two aspects of the quality of the interracial contact which takes place in the six schools. Table 2 presents the results pertaining to Hypothesis 1.

- - - - - - - - - - -

Table 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - - -

In this table, the effect of racial hostility on the inter-school differences in racial attitudes is presented. The critical enteries are found in columns three and four. The former contains the measure (eta) of the inter-school differences in the original means, while the latter (beta) measures the differences between the means after the removal of the covariate.

Table 2 reveals most clearly that hypothesis 1 cannot be sustained for our black subsample. Virtually no change in the inter-school differences can be seen as a result of the removal of the factor of racial hostility. This is true in spite of the fact that in two cases (the first and the third) the covariate is significantly related to the dependent variable.

Among whites, the cognitive factor, perception of descrimination, is not affected by levels of racial hostility. However, this covariate does reduce the inter-school differences which are found on the conative (racial distance) and affective (sympathy with black protest) dimensions. This leads to an acceptance of Hypothesis 1 for whites only.

Hypothesis 2 tests whether the achievement and self-confidence levels of blacks are affected by racial hostility.

Table 2

Simple One-Way Analyses of Covariance Testing Hypothesis 1[a]

	Covariate: Racial Hostility	Main Effect: School	Unadjusted eta	Adjusted beta	R	R^2	N
	Perception of Discrimination						
whites	.001	.001	.51	.52	.509	.259	289
blacks	.003	.999	.08	.07	.091	.008	349
	Racial Distance						
whites	.001	.001	.53	.43	.547	.299	292
blacks	.107	.001	.22	.22	.230	.053	353
	Sympathy with Black Protest						
whites	.001	.001	.52	.41	.534	.286	289
blacks	.029	.001	.25	.24	.254	.064	350

a. The first two columns of this and subsequent tables gives the significance level for the F-ratio of the covariate and the main effect in the analysis of covariance. The unadjusted eta is the measure of the extent to which school means differ without taking the covariate into account, and the adjusted beta is the analogous measure performed after the covariate has been removed from the school means.

- - - - - - - - - - -

Table 3 about here

- - - - - - - - - - -

Once again, it is clear that racial hostility does little to explain the inter-school differences of blacks, even though it is related to several of these dependent variables. There is a slight reduction of differences in the case of verbal achievement and educational aspiration, but otherwise, there is either no change, or a slight increase. In each case but ego strength, the school differences remain highly significant. We conlude by rejecting Hypothesis 2.

The third hypothesis represents our final test of contact theory. It measures the effect which interracial friendship has on reducing inter-school differences in racial attitudes.

- - - - - - - - - - -

Table 4 about here

- - - - - - - - - - -

The pattern which we find resembles very closely those which have emerged in the earlier tables. Interracial friendships possess a significant relationship with these three racial attitudes in half the instances. The strongest of these is with the racial distance dimension for blacks and the sympathy with black protest for whites. However, in spite of these relationships, no notable reduction in inter-school differences in racial attitudes is brought about. The school-wide differences are not produced by differing levels of interracial differences. Hypothesis 3 must therefore be rejected.

Hypothesis 4 is designed to test deprivation theory. Deprivation can, of course, be operationalized in many ways. Here, we have chosen a measure of socioeconomic level, developed by Bachman (1970) from fathers' and mother's education and occupation, quality of housing and possessions in the home. This theoretical approach has general applicability: deprivation has been found by earlier research to underlie a broad range of phenomena.

Table 3

Simple One-Way Analyses of Covariance Testing Hypothesis 2.

	Covariate: Racial Hostility	Main Effect: School	Unadjusted eta	Adjusted beta	R	R^2	N
	Ego Strength						
blacks	.052	.056	.17	.16	.178	.032	350
	Occupational Aspiration						
blacks	.049	.001	.25	.25	.255	.065	357
	Educational Aspiration						
blacks	.003	.025	.21	.18	.224	.050	358
	Verbal Achievement						
blacks	.001	.001	.38	.35	.389	.151	256
	GPA						
lacks	.001	.015	.11	.13	.127	.016	358

Table 4

Simple One-Way Analyses of Covariance Testing Hypothesis 3

	Covariate: Racial Hostility	Main Effect: School	Unadjusted eta	Adjusted beta	R	R^2	N
	Perception of Discrimation						
whites	.999	.001	.38	.38	.380	.144	588
blacks	.999	.999	.08	.09	.089	.008	360
	Racial Distance						
whites	.018	.001	.46	.46	.473	.223	562
blacks	.001	.004	.22	.19	.276	.076	362
	Sympathy with Black Protest						
whites	.001	.001	.40	.41	.409	.167	559
blacks	.999	.001	.25	.25	.255	.065	359

Therefore, we shall covary socioeconomic level with each of our dependent variables.

- - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 5 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - -

We begin with the racial attitudes. The clearest pattern in each of these first three cases is that inter-school differences in whites' attitudes are reduced, particularly in the cases of racial distance and perception of discrimination. Among blacks, there is no reduction in inter-school differences in the perception of discrimination, for the simple reason that there were no significant differences to begin with. The racial distance case does not satisfy Hypothesis 4 for blacks, but the hypothesized condition is met in the case of blacks' sympathy for black protest. Overall, Hypothesis 4 is reasonably well satisfied by the racial attitude variables.

The political attitudes are presented next. For the whites, only one of the three variables, political efficacy, meets the hypothesized conditions the reduction of inter-school differences by the covarying of socioeconomic level. For blacks, the matter is clouded by the fact that only in the case of political interest were significant inter-school differences observed initially. Here, however, we find that those differences are reduced by the removal of the effects of socioeconomic level. Hypothesis 4 is only partially satisfied by the political attitude data.

The inter-school differences in self-confidence, by contrast, are reduced without exception, and in most cases, the reduction is marked. Where inter-school differences in ego-strength and aspiration levels were originally quite strong, when socioeconomic level is removed, not one set of differences remains at a significant level ($p < .05$) for either race. Hypothesis 4 is strongly confirmed in this case.

Table 5

Simple One-Way Analyses of Covariance Testing Hypothesis 4

	Covariate Racial Hostility	Main Effect: School	Unadjusted eta	Adjusted beta	R	R^2	N
	Perception of Discrimination						
whites	.001	.001	.38	.35	.379	.144	557
blacks	.170	.999	.09	.07	.098	.10	356
	Racial Distance						
whites	001	.001	.46	.40	.468	.219	561
blacks	.999	.001	.22	.23	.224	.050	358
	Sympathy with Black Protest						
whites	.001	.001	.40	.35	.408	.147	558
blacks	.001	.008	.26	.21	.269	.072	355
	Political Interest						
whites	.001	.026	.15	.16	.258	.066	563
blacks	001	.212	.16	.11	.230	.053	364
	Political Efficacy						
whites	.001	.006	.27	.22	.276	.076	555
blacks	.241	.999	.05	.07	.091	.008	342
	Political Cynicism						
whites	.131	.032	.14	.14	.151	.023	552
blacks	.999	.999	.07	.09	.087	.008	341

Table 5 (continued)

	Ego Strength						
whites	.050	.999	.14	.08	.184	.034	562
blacks	.001	.999	.17	.03	.277	.077	354
	Occupational Aspiration						
whites	.050	.099	.07	.03	.089	.008	531
blacks	.001	.099	.25	.16	.273	.075	352
	Educational Aspiration						
whites	.001	.107	.31	.15	.353	.125	563
blacks	.001	.999	.21	.09	.273	.075	362
	Verbal Achievement						
whites	.001	.119	.23	.12	.291	.085	458
blacks	.001	.001	.39	.24	.472	.223	256
	GPA						
whites	.052	.382	.09	.09	.118	.014	563
blacks	.999	.188	.11	.13	.115	.013	362

Finally, we have removed socioeconomic level from verbal achievement and grade point average to test whether inter-school differences are reduced. In the case of verbal achievement, there is a very clear movement in that direction for both races, although for blacks, significant inter-school differences remain. We also find, however, that inter-school differences on grade point average are not reduced by the control for socioeconomic level. Since grade point average is self-reported, we are inclined to vest greater confidence in the pattern presented by verbal achievement. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 appears to be confirmed in the area of achievement.

Overall, Hypothesis 4 is subjected to nineteen tests in Table 5 (22 total sets of differences, minus three where these differences were not significant in the first place), including grade point average. The results are fourteen cases where Hypothesis 4 is satisfied and five where it is not. If grade point average is removed, this becomes fourteen positive results and only three negative. Hypothesis 4 is therefore confirmed. We also note the particularly strong effects this covariate has on differences in mean self-confidence and verbal achievement.

The two final hypotheses test socialization theory. Here, the covariates are the attitudes of the parents and the peers, reported by those individuals themselves, and measured on scales identical to those which produced the original student attitudes.

Hypothesis 5 investigates the impact which parental attitudes have on inter-school differences in racial and political attitudes, and self-confidence

- - - - - - - - - - -

Table 6 about here

- - - - - - - - - - -

Looking first at the racial attitudes, we find that for whites, while significant inter-school differences persist, the control for parental attitude

Table 6

Simple One-Way Analyses of Covariance Testing Hypothesis 5

	Covariate: Racial Hostility	Main Effect: School	Unadjusted eta	Adjusted beta	R	R^2	N
	Perception of Discrimination						
whites	.001	.001	.37	.26	.452	.205	403
blacks	.13	.062	.19	.18	.196	.039	245
	Parents' Racial Distance						
	Racial Distance						
whites	.001	.001	.49	.37	.597	.356	408
blacks	.002	.001	.29	.27	.333	.111	242
	Parents' Sympathy with Black Protest						
whites	.001	.001	.41	.27	.508	.258	404
blacks	.309	.001	.28	.28	.279	.078	243
	Parents' Political Efficacy						
	Political Efficacy						
whites	.001	.009	.2[illegible]	.20	.293	.086	405
blacks	.020	.999	.0[illegible]	.06	.163	.027	235
	Parents' Political Cynicism						
	Political Cynicism						
whites	.166	.060	.13	.13	.140	.020	554
blacks	.060	.999	.07	.07	.122	.015	345

Table 6 (continued)

	Parents' Occupational Aspiration						
	Occupational Aspiration						
whites	.002	.999	.06	.06	.184	.034	327
blacks	.001	.999	.21	.10	.438	.192	229
	Parents' Educational Aspiration						
	Educational Aspiration						
whites	.001	.107	.31	.15	.353	.125	563
blacks	.006	.008	.22	.20	.246	.060	231

has reduced those differences in every case. Among blacks, however, no such pattern exists. School differences remain fully as strong as they were without the control for parental attitude (except in the case of perception of discrimination, where no significant differences existed initially). In the area of political attitudes, Hypothesis 5 is clearly satisfied only for whites.

In the realm of political attitudes, nearly the same pattern emerges. Inter-school differences in white attitudes are reduced in the cases of political interest and political efficacy, but not in the case of political cynicism, by the control for parental attitude. For the black subsample, only political interest displayed initially significant inter-school differences, and these are not reduced by the parental attitude covariate. Again, Hypothesis 5 appears to be satisfied for whites (in two of the three cases), while it is rejected for blacks.

The final section of the table contains the level of aspiration measures. (Ego strength is omitted because the parental measure was not available.) Here, a curious pattern emerges. For whites, parental aspirations reduce inter-school differences in educational aspiration, while for blacks, the parental effect is to reduce inter-school differences in occupational aspiration.

The overall judgement of Hypothesis 5 is a good deal more difficult than was the case for Hypothesis 4. There were thirteen sets of differences where reduction was possible (plus three sets of initially non-significant differences). Of these, seven were reduced by the covariation. However, the picture becomes clearer if we consider the racial division. Of the eight sets of white differences, six were reduced, compared to only one of the five sets of black differences. Therefore, we conclude that Hypothesis 5 is acceptable for whites, but is rejected for blacks.

The final hypothesis is tested by the results presented in Table 7. These are the covariations of the peers' attitudes, again covering the areas of racial and political attitudes, and aspiration levels.

- - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 7 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - -

In the area of racial attitudes, the influence of the peers emerges with reasonable strength for the whites. Both the differences produced by racial attitudes and those produced by sympathy with black protest show important reductions. In the case of blacks, there is no reduction, due primarily to the fact that peer attitude is not significantly related to the students' own attitudes on these dimensions. Hypothesis 6 is therefore confirmed for whites and rejected for blacks.

Turning to the area of political attitudes, we see that the peers have virtually no impact on inter-school differences, even though there is a significant relationship between peer and student feeling for whites on all three dimensions. Hypothesis 6 must be rejected here.

Finally, we have the two measures of aspiration. (Ego strength is omitted because peer ego strength was unavailable.) The peers have no effect at all on the inter-school differences in occupational aspiration for either race. In the case of educational aspiration, however, the pattern changes. The control for the aspirations of the white students' peers does bring about a small reduction in inter-school differences. The black pattern is similar, and the reduction in inter-school differences is equally unimpressive. We therefore conclude that Hypothesis 6 is not satisfied in this section.

The overall assessment of Hypothesis 6 reveals a pattern similar to that found in the previous table. Of the eight white differences, only four reveal any reduction in inter-school differences. However, two of these, and the

Table 7

Simple One-Way Analyses of Covariance Testing Hypothesis 6

	Covariate: Peers' Perception of Discrimination	Main Effect: School	Unadjusted eta	Adjusted beta	R	R^2	N
	Perception of Discrimination						
whites	.001	.001	.37	.36	.374	.140	528
blacks	.292	.999	.07	.07	.087	.008	340
	Peer's Racial Distance						
	Racial Distance						
whites	.001	.001	.48	.38	.494	.244	531
blacks	.163	.005	.21	.21	.206	.043	342
	Peer's Sympathy with Black Protest						
	Sympathy with Black Protest						
whites	.001	.001	.40	.33	.409	.167	528
blacks	.121	.001	.25	.24	.247	.061	339
	Peer's Political Interest						
	Political Interest						
whites	.001	.101	.15	.12	.189	.036	533
blacks	.009	.036	.17	.16	.208	.043	347

Table 7 (continued)

	Peers' Political Efficacy	Political Efficacy					
whites	.001	.001	.28	.26	.280	.079	545
blacks	.999	.999	.04	.05	.049	.002	323

	Peers' Political Cynicism	Political Cynicism					
whites	.019	.225	.12	.10	.145	.021	526
blacks	.203	.999	.06	.05	.088	.008	325

	Peer's Occupational Aspiration	Occupational Aspiration					
whites	.999	.999	.07	.07	.070	.005	503
blacks	.227	.001	.26	.28	.260	.067	337

	Peer's Educational Aspiration						
whites	.001	.001	.32	.28	.324	.105	532
blacks	.004	.230	.21	.18	.230	.053	347

only two of any size, are in the area of racial attitudes. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 can be accepted for whites only where racial attitude differences are concerned.

For blacks, no important reductions emerge as a result of the covariance of peer attitudes. Hypothesis 6 is rejected for blacks.

Discussion

The preceding section presents a rather disparate set of results. The task of this concluding section is to attempt to draw a pattern from those results, and to consider the significance of that pattern.

The following table will facilitate the first task. In it, we present each of the four areas into which the dependent variables are grouped, along with the various covariations which were carried out, grouped according to the theoretical orientation which each one tested.

- - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 8 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - -

Perhaps the most striking finding to emerge from the above results involves contact theory. The three hypotheses presented above produced four separate tests of this approach, and two of these involved tests for each race. Out of these six trials, only in one instance could school differences be explained to any extent whatsoever by the measures of racial hostility present in the school environment (racial hostility and interracial friendship). This single success was produced by the white students, where school differences in racial distance and sympathy with black protest were reduced (although significant differences remained in both cases) by this control.

Why, then, do we fail to find that knowledge of level of racial hostility in a school, or the extent of interracial friendship, explains the differences

Table 8

A Summary of Results

	Racial Attitudes	Political Attitudes	Self-Confidence	Achievement
Contact				
Hostility	whites only	NA	Rejected (blacks only)	Rejected (blacks only)
Friendship	Rejected	NA	NA	NA
Deprivation	Accepted	Weak	Strong	Accepted (Verbal achievement only)
Socialization				
Parents	whites only	whites only	Mixed	NA
Peers	whites only	Rejected	Rejected	NA

between that school and another in racial attitudes, self-confidence or achievement? There are two possible explanations. First, there may be other school-level factors which produce the observed differences which operate independently of racial hostility. These may, for instance, involve the standards demanded by the teachers, as suggested by Katz (1964). This would be a plausible avenue for investigation in those cases where the covariate is significantly related to the dependent variable, yet inter-school differences are not diminished.

Alternately, we may turn to the possiblity that the covariates in question simply do not relate to racial attitudes. This is true on five occasions in Tables 2, 3, and 4, three times among blacks and twice among whites. While the preceding explanation does not call contact theory into question, here we are faced with exactly that problem. Particularly among blacks in the context of racial attitudes, the expectations produced by contact theory are not met.

Why this is true must remain conjectural here. Suffice it to say that among those studies which have noted that interracial contact is related to a change in racial attitudes at the individual level should procede with caution. Not only is this not true in all cases, but even when it is, there is no assurance that school-level differences will be reduced if interracial contact is introduced.

The second approach to be tested was deprivation theory. This multi-faceted concept was operationalized in a very simple way: through the development of a measure of socio-economic level (cf. Bachman). Referring to the third row of Table 8, we find that socio-economic level was covaried against each of the four sets of dependent variables. In each case, a reduction in inter-school differences emerged. This was particularly true

in the area of self-confidence. In each of the six trials, inter-school differences were reduced to a non-significant level (see Table 5).

In one sense, these results are dissatisfying. Of course, they corrobarate a good deal of earlier work, particularly that of Coleman (1966). However, to know that inter-school differences rest on differences in socio-economic level among the schools tells us nothing about the dynamics of the situation. We need to push back to limits of knowledge so that we begin to discover what it is about a lower socio-economic status that leads to political cynicism, or prejudiced racial attitudes. Some suggestions have emerged with respect to this problem, as has been noted above (Abramson, Rodgers, Smith). Our results are particularly in concert with Abramson's (1972) and Rodgers' (1974) approach, and they should encourage additional investigation into this promising area.

Finally, we tested socialization theory as an explanatory strategy for inter-school differences. Our covariates were limited to parents' and peers' attitudes, and in general, rather neglible effects emerged.

For whites, socialization theory did prove useful in explaining inter-school differences in political and racial attitudes. Of these six instances, there was a reduction in five, and the sixth showed no initial relationship (between parents' and students' political cynicism). For blacks, however, only in the area of occupational aspiration did any reduction in inter-school differences come about when the partental attribute was removed.

The influence of the peers is even weaker. Only in the case of white racial attitudes did we observe any reduction in the inter-school differences. Again, the races are differentiated by the fact that the peers' attitudes are significantly related to the white students' attitudes in seven of eight instances, while the same is true of blacks in but two of the eight.

Over-all, it appears that socialization theory is simply not the appropriate path to take for an understanding of black differences. Our black respondents pay practically no attention to their peers, and even the parental attitudes are not observed to be closely related to the student responses in half the instances. This result provides a corrective to the mainstream of political socialization research, which tends to be rather optimistic about the impact of agents on political learning, but is often neglectful of minority patterns (Easton and Dennis; Hess and Torney).

For whites, the expectations of socialization theory are confirmed in ten of sixteen instances. While the relationship between parent or peer and student is consistently strong, in contrast to the blacks, the failure to confirm our hypotheses arises mainly because significant relationships do not reduce inter-school differences.

In summary, our results support the following conclusions. Contact theory is generally unsatisfactory as an approach to understanding inter-school differences. Socialization theory is appropriate in some instances, but only for whites. Deprivation theory produces quite satisfactory results in all the areas tested. Its drawback is that it succeeds only in asking the basic question a different way: we must immediately concern ourselves with the processes and motivational dynamics involved with belonging to a high or low socio-economic level.

We return finally to one of the initial points made by St. John (1975). The phenomenon of school desegregation is a complex one, and will continue to evade our understanding if we persist in over-simplyfying it. Our results show above all else that merely to demonstrate that a factor such as interracial contact exists at the individual level says nothing necessarily about the nature of attitudes at the level of the school. Other

factors may come into play which negate entirely whatever effect interracial contact or familial socialization, for instance, may have on the individual. It is these unknown factors which have produced the unconsistency of findings deplored by St. John (1975), and it is the identification of these factors to which future work must be devoted.

Appendix

School Facilities

Health Exams
Library
Social Worker
Recreation Worker
School Counselor
School Psychologist
Cafeteria
Gym Locker Rooms
Swimming Pool
Athletic Field
Television Receivers
Auditorium
Sound Movie Projector
Slide Projector
Radios
Teaching Machines
Phonographs
Assembly Programs
Study Halls
School Buses
Physics Lab Equipment
Local Newspapers
Out-of-Town Newspapers
Historical Maps
News Magazines
Closed Circuit TV
Chemistry Lab Equipment
Language Lab

Extracurricular Activities

Student Government
School Newspaper
School Magazine
Inter-school Athletics for Boys
Inter-school Athletics for Girls
Intramural Athletics for Boys
Intramural Athletics for Girls
Occupation Clubs
Drama, Plays
Debate
Dances
Orchestra
Band
Glee Club, Choir, Chorus
Fraternities
Sororities
National Honor Society
Subject Matter Clubs
Hobby Clubs
Military Cadets
Service Clubs
Religious Clubs

Racial Distance

i. In general, it is all right for black and white people to work together at the same job.

ii. In general, it is all right for black and white people to be close friends.

iii. In general, it is all right for black and white people to go to the same parties and social events.

iv. In general, it is all right for black and white people to marry one another.

v. In general, it is all right for black and white people to date each other.

Perception of Discrimination

i. Do you think that in Georgia, many, some, or few blacks miss out on jobs and promotions because of racial discrimination?

ii. Do you think that in Georgia, many, some, or few blacks miss out on good housing because white owners won't rent to them?

iii. On the average, black people in Georgia have worse jobs, education, and housing than white people. Do you think this is mainly due to blacks being discriminated against, or mainly due to something about blacks themselves.

Sympathy Toward Black Protest

i. Some say that the riots in some northern cities during the late 1960's were mainly a protest against unfair conditions. Others say they were mainly a way of looting and things like that. Which of these seems more correct to you?

ii. Some say that blacks have been pushing too fast for what they want. Others feel they haven't pushed fast enough. How about you?

iii. Do you think blacks are justified in using orderly marches to protest against racial discrimination?

Ego Strength (Rotter Scale)

i. I have usually felt pretty sure my life would work out the way I want it to. --OR-- There have been times when I haven't been very sure about it.

ii. I feel that I am the kind of person who gets more than his share of bad luck. --OR-- I feel that I have mostly good luck.

iii. When I make plans ahead I usually get to carry out things the way I expected. --OR-- When I make plans ahead things usually come up to make me change my plans.

iv. I have strong opinions about a good many things. --OR-- I am more in the middle of the road.

v. When I get into an argument I often give in. --OR-- When I get into an argument, I usually get my own way.

vi. When I make up my mind about something it is pretty hard to argue me out of it. --OR-- I change my mind pretty easily.

Educational Aspiration

Suppose you could have as many more years of education as you wanted. How much education would you like to have?

Occupational Aspiration

Now, tell me what kind of job you would most like to have, if you could do anything you wanted?

Political Cynicism

i. Do you think the government wastes much of the money we pay in taxes?

ii. How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right?

iii. Do you feel that the people running the government are smart people who usually know what they're doing?

Political Efficacy

i. People like me don't have any say in what the government does.

ii. Voting is the only way people like me can have any say about how the government runs things.

iii. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't understand what's going on.

iv. I don't think public officials care much what people like me think.

Political Interest

Some people don't pay much attention to the political campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you were very interested, somewhat interested, not much interested in the 1972 Presidential campaign between Nixon and McGovern?

Hypothesis 1--Racial Hostility

i. Would you say that black and white students at this school get together a lot between classes and after school, and things like that, or do they stick pretty much to themselves?

ii. In the last year or two, would you say there has been friction between races at your school, or hasn't this been a problem?

Hypothesis 3--Interracial Friendship

i. About how many of your friends are (white/black). I mean of all your friends, not just your closest friends.

ii. (Count of named peers of opposite race.)

Hypothesis 4--Socioeconomic Level (Cf. Bachman, p. 11)

i. Father's occupational status

ii. Father's education

iii. Mother's education

iv. Possessions in the home
encyclopedia
dictionary
daily newspaper
newsmagazine

v. Number of books in the home

vi. Number of rooms per person in the home

Hypotheses 5 and 6

The parents' and peers' messages are operationalized as the responses to the identical items as were administered to the students; see above.

Footnotes

1. The measure of socioeconomic level is a replication of Bachman (1970) pp. 9-14 and 213-223).

References

Abramson, P. (1972) "Political Efficacy and Political Trust Among Black Schoolchildren: Two Explanations." Journal of Politics, 34 (November): 1243-1275.

Adler, N. and Harrington, C. (1970) The Learning of Political Behavior. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Allport, G. (1954) The Nature of Prejudice. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Ausubel, D. and Ausubel, P. (1963) "Ego Development among Segregated Negro Children." In A. Harry Passow (Ed.), Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Columbia University, 109-141.

Arendt, H. (1959) "Reflections on Little Rock." Dissent, (Winter): 45-55.

Armstrong, C. and Gregor, A. (1964) "Integrated Schools and Negro Character Development: Some Considerations of the Possible Effects." Psychiatry, 27 (February): 69-72.

Bachman, J. (1970) Youth in Transition, Volume II. Ann Arbor, Institute for Social Research.

Bogardus, E. (1925) "Measuring Social Distances." Journal of Applied Sociology, 9: 299-308.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1967) "The Psychological Costs of Quality and Equality in Education." Child Development, 38 (December): 909-925.

Bullock, C. (1976) "The Impact of Southern School Desegregation: Interracial Contact and Student Prejudice." Youth and Society, forthcoming.

Campbell, A. (1971) White Attitudes toward Black People. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.

Campbell, B. (1975a) "Peer Influence in Political Socialization." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Nashville, Tennessee, November 6-8, 1975.

Campbell, B. (1975b) "The Acquisition of Political Trust: Explorations of Socialization Theory." Paper presented at the annual meeting of The American Political Science Association, San Francisco, California, September, 1975.

Coleman, J. (1961) The Adolescent Society. New York: The Free Press.

Coleman, J. (1966) Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Coles, R. (1967) Children of Crisis: A Study of Courage and Fear. Boston: Little, Brown.

Deutsch, M. and Collins, M. (1951) Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Easton, D. and Dennis, J. (1969) Children in the Political System. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ehrlich, H. (1973) The Social Psychology of Prejudice. New York: John Wiley.

Erikson, E. (1968) Identity, Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton

Harding, J., Proshansky, H., Kutner, B., and Chein, I. (1969) "Prejudice and Ethnic Relations." In A. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.) Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 37-76.

Hess, R. and Torney, J. (1967) The Development of Political Attitudes in Children. Chicago: Aldine.

Holland, F. (1964) "A Comment on the Segregated Learning Situation as an Insulating Device for the Negro Child." Psychiatry, 27 (August): 301-303.

Jennings, K. and Niemi, R. (1974) The Political Character of Adolescence. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kandel, D. and Lesser, G. (1969) "Parental and Peer Influences in Educational Plans of Adolescents." American Sociological Review, 34: 213-223.

Katz, I. (1964) "Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes." American Psychologist, 19: 381-399.

Lee, A. and Humphrey, N. (1943) Race Riot. New York: Dryden.

McPartland, J. (1968) "The Segregated Student in Desegregated Schools: Sources of Influence on Negro Secondary Students." Center for the Study of the Social Organization of Schools, Report No. 21. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

Mahan, T. (1968) Project Concern--1966-68: A Report on the Effectiveness of Suburban School Placement for Inner-City Youth. Hartford: Board of Education.

Merton, R. (1957) Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press.

Newcomb, T. (1966) "The General Nature of Peer Group Influences." In Newcomb, T. and Wilson, E. (Eds.) College Peer Groups. Chicago: Aldine.

Pettigrew, T. (1971) Racially Separate or Together? New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pinderhughes, C. (1964) "Effects of Ethnic Group Concentration upon Education Process, Personality Formation and Mental Health." Journal of the National Medical Association, 56: 407.

Remmers, H. and Radler, D. (1957) The American Teenager. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Rodgers, H. (1974) "Toward Explanation of the Political Efficacy and Political Cynicism of Black Adolescents: An Exploratory Study." American Journal of Political Science, XVIII (May): 257-282.

Rotter, J. (1966) "Generalized Expectancies for Internal vs. External Control of Reinforcement." Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 80.

St. John, N. (1975) School Desegregation Outcomes for Children. New York: John Wiley.

Sebert, S. (1974) "The Influence of Friends on the Political Socialization of High School Seniors." Ph.D. dissertation, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

United States Commission on Civil Disorders. (1968) Report. New York: Bantam Books.

Haggstrom, W. (1963) "Segregation, Desegregation and Negro Personality." Integrated Education, 1 (October/November): 19-23.